

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,141	07/02/2007	Mara Rossi	ROSSI 10	1796
99/14/2010 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			SEHARASEYON, JEGATHEESAN	
SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/586,141 ROSSI ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit JEGATHEESAN 1646 SEHARASEYON -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2010. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1,121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner, Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 10/586,141 Page 2

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendments and remarks filed
Claim 4 is cancelled. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3 and 4. Applicant has added claims 6-8. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-8 are pending and examined.

Any objection or rejection of record, which is not expressly repeated in this action, has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be neadtived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Application/Control Number: 10/586,141

Art Unit: 1646

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3a. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 6-8 (newly) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musacchio et al. (1996) in view of Li et al. (WO98/14467) and Proudfoot et al. (WO02/28419) both provided in the IDS of 7/17/06 for reasons set forth in the Office Acton dated 3/26/10.

Applicant is arguing that from the reading of Musacchio et al. it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that reverse phase chromatography used for menicgococcal Opc protein could be applied to a chemokine prior to a refolding step and still achieve high yields and high purity. Thus, it is asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to the presently claimed process by the combination of disclosures and teachings from Musacchio, Li and Proudfoot. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Specifically, the use of reverse phase chromatography prior to refolding used in menicgococcal Opc protein purification is not unique to menicococcal Opc protein. The prior art teaches that proteins expressed as inclusion bodies in E.coli after solubilization can be purified using reverse phase chromatography (see Musacchio et al. and Li et al.). Interposing a Reverse Phase Chromatography is taught by Musacchio et al. The limitations present in the newly added claims such as the ion exchange chromatography (claims 6 and 7) and filtration (claim 8) are taught in Li et al. (pages 26-27). In addition, the motivation to combine can arise from the expectation that the prior art elements will perform their

expected functions to achieve their expected results when combine for their common known purpose. Section MPEP 2144.07. Therefore, 1-3, 5 and 6-8 (newly) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musacchio et al. (1996) in view of Li et al. (WO98/14467) and Proudfoot et al. (WO02/28419).

Conclusion

- No claims are allowed.
- THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEGATHEESAN SEHARASEYON whose telephone number is (571)272-0892. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary B. Nickol, Ph. D can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christine J Saoud/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

JS 9/11/10